



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/436,973	11/09/1999	MARK E. PENNELL	003824.P003	7363

30256 7590 05/22/2003

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P  
600 HANSEN WAY  
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1043

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	8

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/436,973	PENNELL ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Matthew J. Ludwig	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 1999.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                    2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 2-81 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 2,3,5-9,11-27,29,34,35,37-39,43-63,65-68 and 73-81 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) 4,10,28,30-33,36,40-42,64 and 69-72 is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7. 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed 11/09/99. The application claims benefit of a provisional application 60107791 filed 11/10/98.
2. Claims 2-81 are pending in the case. Claims 2, 33, 66-68, 75, 80, and 81 are independent claims. The applicant cancelled claim 1 according to preliminary amendment filed 3/19/01.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 4,6, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**In reference to dependent claims 4**, the limitation recites, “program code units”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim and is therefore rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph.

**In reference to dependent claim 6**, the limitation recites “wherein obtaining the program code includes creating the program code”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

**In reference to dependent claim 36**, the limitation recites, “program code units”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim and is therefore rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 2, 5, 7, 9, 10-13, 15-21, 24-27, 34, 35, 37-39, 43, 46, 50-55, 58-63, and 65-67, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Kaply U.S. Patent Number 6,112,215 filed (9/24/98).

**In reference to independent claim 2**, Kaply teaches the steps of:

In the case of a global network such as the Internet, the present invention may be operatively associated with the Internet browser or even from a component of the browser. The method of receiving a request for user data is demonstrated with a program for developing and presenting a menu representative of a set of repetitively needed data entries within a web browser environment. The menu offers the user the opportunity to retrieve user data corresponding to the user. The reference further discloses a menu, which is inherently executed

by program code, for the user to enter at least a portion of the user data into the electronic form.

See column 2, lines 14-18 and column 3, lines 5-10.

**In reference to dependent claim 5, Kaply teaches:**

The program of the present invention may conveniently be incorporated into a browser program whereby, as pages of Internet are brought up, the database of the present invention may be accessed for the making of repetitive data entries. See column 6, lines 10-20.

**In reference to dependent claim 7, Kaply teaches:**

Kaply discloses requested entries, which are frequent or repetitive entries, known or believed to be in the database of such entries. The menu of the items in the database is brought up, and displayed whereby the page on the screen is linked to the database through the menu, so that items from the menu may be selected and transferred to the page as data entries. See column 6, lines 20-36. The limitations of "obtaining the program code includes retrieving the program code" are met by the program code utilized to access the menu and presenting the user direct access to data entries.

**In reference to dependent claim 9, Kaply teaches:**

Some typical major elements connected to the Internet are user network connected through server at a node. See column 4, lines 30-36.

**In reference to dependent claim 10, Kaply teaches:**

The user is being prompted for repetitive information as the computer name, user name and a licensing key. Menu is brought up and appropriate selections are made and entered into fields through to provide the completed initial display screen. See column 5, lines 40-45.

**In reference to dependent claim 11, Kaply teaches:**

The menu of the present invention representative of the items of the database may be superimposed on any interface display screen requiring data entries. See column 5, lines 50-60.

**In reference to dependent claim 12, Kaply teaches:**

Until required by the computer system, the program instructions may be stored in another readable medium. See column 6, lines 45-55.

**In reference to dependent claims 13, Kaply teaches:**

In browsing the Internet, accessing particular databases and arranging to be billed for Internet services, it may be seen that much of this information is repetitive and needs to be entered again and again, many times. The limitations “user data includes contact information” and “user data includes credit information” are met by the reference demonstrating the user being billed for Internet services. See column 5, lines 20-26.

**In reference to dependent claim 15, Kaply teaches:**

The user is being prompted for repetitive information as the computer name, user name and a licensing key. Here again, menu is brought up and appropriate selections are made and entered into fields through to provide the completed initial display screen. See column 5, lines 39-45.

**In reference to dependent claim 16, Kaply teaches:**

The user points out and transfers appropriate selected data entries from the menu to appropriate fields. The information transferred from the database into the selected appropriate data entry fields in the display screen by any convention means, e.g. “drag and drop”. See column 5, lines 34-38 and column 5, lines 55-60.

**In reference to dependent claim 17, Kaply teaches:**

The database may be continuously updated by the user and customized to the users own needs. Then, a displayable menu is created representative of each database entry. See column 6, lines 1-10.

**In reference to dependent claim 18, Kaply teaches:**

The database may be continuously updated by the user and customized to the users own needs. Then, a displayable menu is created representative of each database entry. See column 6, lines 1-10.

**In reference to dependent claim 19, Kaply teaches:**

A program for developing and presenting a menu representative of a set of repetitively needed data entries. See column 3, lines 5-10.

**In reference to dependent claim 20 & 21, Kaply teaches:**

The user points out and transfers appropriate selected data entries from the menu to appropriate fields through to produce the completed data entry screen. See column 5, lines 34-40. The reference demonstrates the utilization of multiple entries for each data field on a pull down list.

**In reference to dependent claims 24-27, Kaply teaches:**

The user points out and transfers appropriate selected data entries from the menu to appropriate fields. The information transferred from the database into the selected appropriate data entry fields in the display screen by any convention means, e.g. "drag and drop". See column 5, lines 34-38 and column 5, lines 55-60.

In reference to dependent claims 34, 35, 37-39, 43, 46, 50-55, 58-63, 65-66 the limitations of these claims are the system for carrying out the methods of claims 2, 3, 5-7, 11-21, 24-27, and are rejected under the same rationale.

**In reference to independent claims 67,** the limitations of this claim represent the computer program for carrying out the methods of claim 2, and are rejected under the same rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3, 8, 22, 23, 29, 44, 45, 47-49, 56, 57, 68, 73, 74-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaply, U.S. Patent Number 6,112,215 filed (9/24/98) in view of Light et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,192,380 filed (3/31/98)

**In reference to dependent claim 3,** Kaply teaches:

Routines are developed for making the menu displayable, i.e. super imposable over any selected displayed interface screen, to thereby link the menu to the display screen so that the entries may be transferred to fields in the screen or page. See column 6, lines 8-15. Kaply does not explicitly teach program code, which includes a script corresponding to the electronic form. However, Light discloses a form that includes a hypertext markup language tag such as "form", or "input type," indicating that it is a form or that it requires user input. See column 3, lines 1-5. The program code mentioned in Light provides a proficient architecture for the addition of script within electronic forms. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the form fill-in

methods of Kaply and applied the HTML techniques of Light to provide a proficient driven menu for use with electronic forms.

**In reference to dependent claim 8, Light discloses:**

The computer system further comprises a main memory, a dynamic storage device for storing information and instructions to be executed (compare to “the program code is stored on a user computer”). See column 2, lines 27-30. The automatic web based form fill-in methods of Light demonstrate the form recognition techniques necessary for improving recognition in form filling by storing program instructions on a users computer and would have provided Kaply with the added benefit of storing program instructions on a user computer, which would recognize various forms within a network environment. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kaply and Light before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the form fill-in techniques taught by Kaply to include the stored program code of Light, because it would have provided enhanced capabilities of form filling by allowing the user to recognize the specific data for placement into a form.

**In reference to dependent claims 14 & 22, Light discloses,**

A displayed label associated with the entry blank may be copied. Thus, the text “My credit card number is”, is copied, and the tag “credit card number” is extracted from the text. See column 5, lines 50-60. Light demonstrates data entries within a form that would require the user to input credit information. Kaply discloses data entries, which contain user information within a form, but does not explicitly teach supplying credit information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kaply and Light before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the data entry methods taught by Kaply, to include the tag

extraction techniques of Light, because it would have provided Kaply the added benefit or a tag extraction method related to credit information and a fill-in unit to supply the necessary credit information for an enhanced form filling process within a network environment.

**In reference to dependent claim 23, Light discloses:**

The learning subunit scans the form, and determines whether there are any spaces that were filled in by the user, not the fill-in subunit (compare to “multiple entries for each data field have been previously supplied by the user”). See column 4, lines 25-30. The reference demonstrates the specific form fields filled in by a user. Kaply teaches replacing repetitive entries with entries from a menu, but does not explicitly teach multiple entries for each data field previously supplied by the user. It would have been obvious to modify the data entry methods of Kaply to include the user-supplied supplied data entries as taught by Light, because it would have offered Kaply the added benefit of learning new data previously supplied or filled in by the user for a proficient form-filling method.

**In reference to dependent claim 29, Light discloses:**

The user is requested to enter further tags associated with the data. Thus, when the user enters his or her first name, in response to a tag asking for a “first name”, the user may add other tags, such as “given name”, etc. See column 4, lines 47-52. The reference demonstrates various user data sets, which correspond to the same user. Kaply teach multiple data entries within a form-filling environment, but does not explicitly teach the selection of a user data set from multiple user data sets. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kaply to include the multiple data variations of Light,

because it would have provided Kaply with an added benefit of a range of data to choose from when utilizing the form-filling techniques as taught by Light.

**In reference to dependent claims, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49,** the limitations of the claims recite similar limitations to that of claim 8, and therefore are rejected under similar rational.

**In reference to dependent claims 56 & 57,** the limitations of the claims recite similar limitations to that of claims 22 & 23 and are therefore rejected under similar rational.

**In reference to independent claim 68,** Light discloses:

When the user presses enter, or otherwise indicates that the form is completely filled in (compare to “receiving a request form a client”), the learning subunit scans the forms, and determines whether there are any spaces that were filled in by the user. The learning subunit determines whether the data already exists in the database. If it does, the database adding unit adds the new tag to the list of tags associated with the information in the database. If the data is not in the database, the database-adding unit adds the new data and the new tag to the database (compare to “the program code unit being configured to enter data into an electronic form; and initiating transmission of the program code unit to the client”). See column 4, lines 15-30. The reference does not explicitly disclose entering the data establish by the learning subunit into an electronic form; however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Light to include the step of entering the data that was saved in a database into the electronic form for the added benefit of an efficient form-filling technique.

**In reference to dependent claim 73,** Light discloses:

Once the tag recognition unit has extracted a tag, it passes the tag to the matching. The matching unit searches in the database for a similar tag. See column 3, lines 60-65. The reference demonstrates storing user data corresponding to a user through the utilization of tags.

**In reference to dependent claim 74,** Light discloses:

The user may activate the fill-in process by pressing a key, a key combination, a left mouse button, or a similar activation mechanism. See column 5, lines 45-50. The reference demonstrates the user requesting user data and initiating the transmission of the user data through the use of the mouse.

In reference to claims 75-79, the limitations of the claims recite similar limitations to that of claims 68, 73, and 74, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to claims 80 & 81, the limitations of the claims are the system and program code for carrying out the methods of claim 68, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

9. Claims 28 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaply, U.S. Patent Number 6,112,215 filed (9/24/98) in view of Light et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,192,380 filed (3/31/98) and in further view of Bogdan U.S. Patent Number 6,249,284 filed(4/1/98)

**In reference to dependent claim 28,** Bogdan discloses:

A user would enter data in one data entry field at a time while the viewer control automatically moved the cursor to each successive data entry field as each prior data entry field was satisfied. The reference demonstrates the automatic advancement of a cursor within a form-filling environment. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified the data entry methods of Kaply and included the technique discloses in Bogdan, because it would have provided the user an efficient way of filling in form fields.

**In reference to dependent claim 64,** the claim recites similar limitations to those of dependent claim 28, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claims 30-33, and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaply, U.S. Patent Number 6,112,215 filed (9/24/98) in view of Light et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,192,380 filed (3/31/98) and in further view of Gupta et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,199,079 filed (3/20/98)

**In reference to dependent claim 30,** Kaply and Light do not teach comparing Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) of a visited site against a set of URLs for which program code is supposed to be available; however, Gupta discloses methods of associating URLs with form identifiers to determine one or more corresponding matching patterns. The reference demonstrates the utilization and comparisons of URLs as a proficient technique in automatic form filling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kaply to include the URL methods of Gupta, because it would have given the user the added benefit of efficiently locating vendor's sites using URL relationships and automatically filling in required forms.

In reference to dependent claims 31-33, the claims recite similar limitations to those of claim 30, and are therefore rejected under the same rationale.

In reference to dependent claims 40-42, the claims recite the system for carrying out the methods of claim 30, and are therefore rejected under the same rationale.

In reference to dependent claim 69-72, the claims recite similar limitations to that of claim 30-33, and are therefore rejected under the same rationale.

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Atlas et al. US Patent No. 6,208,339 filed (6/19/98)

Goldstein et al. US Patent No. 6,378,075 filed (12/9/99)

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

ML  
May 19, 2003

  
HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100